1	VOTER REGISTRATION: ASSESSING CURRENT PROBLEMS
2	
3	WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2009
4	
5	United States Senate,
6	Committee on Rules and Administration,
7	Washington, D.C.
8	
9	The Committees met, pursuant to notice, at 10:08 a.m., in Room SR-301, Russell
L 0	Senate Office Building, Hon. Charles E. Schumer, Chairman of the Committee, presiding.
L1	Present: Senators Schumer, Pryor, Udall, Warner, and Bennett.
L2	Staff Present: Jean Bordewich, Staff Director; Jason Abel, Chief Counsel;
L3	Veronica Gillespie, Elections Counsel; Adam Ambrogi, Counsel; Carole Blessington,
L 4	Assistant to the Staff Director; Brenna Allen, Professional Staff; Lynden Armstrong, Chief
L 5	Clerk; Matthew McGowan, Professional Staff; Mary Jones, Republican Staff Director;
L 6	Shaun Parkin, Republican Deputy Staff Director; Paul Vinovich, Republican Chief
L 7	Counsel; Michael Merrell, Republican Elections Counsel; Trish Kent, Republican
L 8	Professional Staff; and Rachel Creviston, Republican Professional Staff.
L 9	
20	OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN SCHUMER
21	Chairman Schumer. The Rules Committee shall come to order, and good
22	morning to one and all. And I would like to thank my colleague, Senator Bennett, I look
23	forward to a close and amiable working relationship, whether we agree or disagree on
24	issues, as is his way, in the future.
25	Anyway, this morning our topic is voter registration. If voting is the heart of
26	democracy, registering Americans is the lifeblood of our Republic. But it seems as if we
27	have had some serious circulation problems. What the butterfly ballots and hanging chads
28	were in 2000 is what voter registration problems are today.
29	Today we will hear new groundbreaking reports of astounding problems with our
30	voter registration system. Hidden from the excitement of the past election was the fact
31	that millions of voters, through no fault of their own, were shut out of this process due to
32	deeply-rooted problems that need to be fixed

We will hear from our witnesses and more details, but the numbers are staggering. Professor Ansolabehere's research reveals that as many as 7 million eligible and registered voters were denied the right to vote, whether it was a photo ID requirement, list purges, no match, no vote comparisons, or simply because they moved from one home to the other and their registration did not follow. His astonishing report also estimates that as many as 9 million additional people were prevented from registering due to deadlines and change of residency requirements.

Now, each one of these alone does not seem like an egregious violation, although to the person it might be, but put together, you get massive disenfranchisement, and this is undemocratic, unacceptable. And, of course, as we know, 7 million is often enough to swing a federal election.

Since World War II, the popular vote in 8 of 16 presidential elections could have swung the other way, and hundreds of times over, states could have swung as well if 7 million people who were supposed to vote did not.

Voter registration errors know no party or ideology, so listen to a few stories.

There is the serviceman and his wife who move from base to base and are not allowed to vote because they did not arrive at their new residence to meet the deadline to register. In other words, the Army tells them October 15th you have to be somewhere else November 1st. And yet, the voter registration deadline was October 15th in the new place where they are going. They cannot even vote for their commander and chief, who will determine whether or not the soldier is sent off to war.

Then there is the hardworking father holding down two jobs to put food on the table for his kids, who skips dinnertime to go and vote, only to be turned away simply because his name was confused with that of an ineligible convicted felon.

There is the tradesman who finds his name is not on the list because his handwriting was not clear on his voter registration form. So an A becomes a U, and there is no match for his drivers license, and no vote.

In fact, Joe the Plumber of the 2008 election fame was nearly denied the right to vote last November because his name was misspelled on the voter list. Now, it was a hard name to spell, so I am not blaming anybody, but it is just a fact.

There is a student who attends a university in Virginia only to be told he cannot register to vote at his new domicile, and if he does, he could lose financial aid.

There is a woman who shows up to vote only to find out she was not even registered due to an error made by a third party registration organization who misplaced the form or sent it in too late.

I cannot tell you how many times in New York I have heard the refrain, I registered to vote, and when I showed up, I was told my name was not on the list. So we seem to be stuck in the mud on certain issues.

As I said, each of these stories, they are a little bit poignant, but, you would think, okay, that happens. But when you add them up to 7 million, or 9 million names, it is a lot more troubling than that.

In the 21st century, people should not be denied their constitutional right to vote because of problems caused by an antiquated voter registration system that was set up in the 19th century by the Whig Party. That is who set up our voter registration system, which we still use today. And, of course, the Whigs are not even around anymore.

It is truly remarkable that with the technology we have today that someone could be turned away at the polls simply because he or she has moved to a different county or has bad handwriting. If they move to a different country, they should not vote. But if they move to a different country, they should, or if there is bad handwriting.

It is not to blame our local election officials who work hard to make sure the trains run on time on Election Day. In fact, just yesterday, two secretaries of state, Carnahan, Democrat from Missouri, and Greyson, a Republican from Kentucky, very clearly described the problem state election officials face with voter registration.

I ask unanimous consent their column and roll call be entered into the record. So without objection, it is.

[The information follows:]

/ COMMITTEE INSERT

Chairman Schumer. The question of last minute registration, the massive amount of data entries involved, are a lot to place on local county officials with limited resources. And additionally, the amount of money spent on maintaining current voter registration lists places a strain on state governments already struggling with the current economic crisis. Part of the problem may be that the states and counties need more resources to ensure that all eligible voters can be registered and all those registered can vote.

So today we examine these problems. I cannot imagine what it was like for millions of voters, some of whom attempting to vote for the first time last year, were told they were not registered correctly and could not cast a ballot, particularly after waiting in line for an hour or two, maybe on a cold or rainy evening. I cannot imagine what it was like for these folks to be denied the right to vote in this historic election. So this should not happen, not in the United States of America.

We are not going to talk about solutions today; we are just going to talk about anyone can talk about what they want, but the focus of the hearing is just on the problem. And there are other problems as well. I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about schemes to defraud and register people who should not be registered. And that is something we are going to want to look at as well because I think we have to address both sides of the problem.

But today we are going to look at this particular problem. And I thank all our witnesses and want to turn things over to, first, my colleague, Senator Bennett for a statement, then Senator Warner after him.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR BENNETT

Senator Bennett. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate your calling a hearing. I think it is appropriate that we hear these issues. And I would take slight issue with one comment you made in your opening statement. I think there are still Whigs around.

[Laughter.]

Senator Bennett. I will go no further as to identify where or who, but my study of history and the attitude of the Whig Party leaves me to believe that there are those who still hold that ideology.

Now, we have two compelling and sometimes competing interests with respect to this whole question. We want everyone who is legally qualified to vote to be able to vote. And we want him or her to be able to vote as easily and smoothly as we possibly can. At the same time, the whole purpose for having people register in advance is to create some kind of mechanism that will allow election officials to prevent those who are not legally qualified to vote from voting, and sometimes this becomes a trade off.

In an effort to get everyone to vote, we relax registration requirements and, thereby,

129	open the door to vote fraud; or, conversely, in an effort to prevent vote fraud, we tighten
130	registration requirements, and thereby run the risk of keeping people away who belong
131	there.
132	This is not a new issue. When I was a member of the Governmental Affairs
133	Committee, we held a hearing on this issue and one of the witnesses on that occasion was
134	Dr. Larry Sabato, the director of the University of Virginia Center for Governmental
135	Studies, and one of the more well recognized names when it comes to these issues.
136	I would like in my opening statement to quote a few things from Dr. Sabato, and
137	then would ask unanimous consent that his entire opening statement be included in the
138	record.
139	Chairman Schumer. Without objection.
140	[The statement of Dr. Sabato follows:]
141	Senator Bennett. He makes the same point I just made. He said when we look
142	at the registration system and voting process, we have to balance two conflicting values.
143	One, the goal of full and informed participation in the electorate, and, two, the integrity of
144	the system. And he goes on to say, to the extent we keep expanding the participation right
145	and make it easier and easier for people to register to vote, we almost certainly increase the
146	chances for voter fraud. So, in a sense, it is a trade off. To move completely in the
147	direction of one value as opposed to the other is foolhardy.
148	Then he goes on to list a number of examples of people in the 2000 election who
149	cast illegal votes. If I might, there are the corresponding, one-on-one personal
150	observations of the kind you have just cited of people who ran into difficulty with
151	registration. And he says, it does not stop with Florida and Wisconsin. As I suggested,
152	fraud did not just appear during the 2000 presidential election. Just a glance at the past
153	decade shows many examples of electoral fraud.

Then he goes on to list some. Extensive absentee ballot fraud in Alabama; hundreds of phony registrations in California; nearly a thousand illegal votes in New Jersey, including some people who are unregistered and others who are dead; significant absentee ballot fraud in Philadelphia; votes stolen from the elderly and infirm in Texas, and the list goes on and on.

Then he says in separate quotes, whether fraud is Democratic or Republican, or located in the north or the south or the west, the effect on American democracy is similar.

While electoral hanky-panky affects the outcome in only a small proportion of elections, mainly in very tight races, one fraudulent ballot is one too many for the integrity of the system and the confidence that people have in the system.

So this is the balance that we have to address. We want, as I said, registration to be as open and as easy as it can possibly be for those who are entitled to vote, but at the same time, we want registration to be effective enough that those who are interested in controlling fraud have the tools that they need to deal with that.

That is the balance that I hope we will strive to strike as our legislative activity goes forward following this hearing and other hearings that you may have scheduled. And I appreciate your diligence in addressing the problem and will do whatever I can to see that we have as productive and probing a hearing as possible.

Chairman Schumer. I want to thank Senator Bennett, and I agree with the thrust of his statement. Both are problems, and I think we have to address both. And there is sort of a yin and yang here that you have to find the happy balance to.

Senator Warner?

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR WARNER

Senator Warner. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to add my voice as well and say thank you for calling this hearing and echoing both what you and Senator Bennett have said, this yin and yang between registration and fraud.

I am not going to be able to stay for the whole hearing, but I do want to point out two issues that I hope the panel will address and would love to pursue. One, and the chairman mentioned this in his opening comments, Virginia has become a little bit of ground zero for the battle between local registrars trying to determine what is appropriate for college students, sometimes out-of-state college students, who choose to registrar in their college hometown rather than their parents' hometown. We have, perhaps, in the Commonwealth given a little bit of disjointed guidance.

So I would love to hear from the panel, what appears to be both trends in the law and best practices, on how you get that balance. We clearly want students to participate; if they are living 9 or 10 months a year in a certain locale, what kind of residency requirements are looked at. On the other hand, if they are simply passing through and often time there are concerns at the local government level that you may end up having, in

fact, undue influence because of the student population in the community. So I would love to hear comments on that issue.

The second and this is Virginia also. Like other states, but I think Virginia because we are proud to have some of the highest concentration of military of any state in the country, we have lots and lots military families who continue to be challenged with not only registration but unclear rules about when and how they have to get their ballots posted, when and how registrars would receive those ballots.

As recently as the 2008 election cycle, again, this proved to be quite a bone of contention. And I would love to hear any comments from the panel on how we can better grapple with the very unique challenges that our military families, particularly those who are posted overseas, can make sure that, one, they get registered in the first place, and two, that there is no undue burdens on them participating in the electoral process.

So, again, while I am not going to be able to stay for the hearing, I do appreciate the chairman calling this and anxious to hear comments on those two questions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Schumer. Thank you. And I think those are two very important issues that we hope to explore.

Senator Udall?

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR UDALL

Senator Udall. Thank you, Chairman Schumer and Ranking Member Bennett. Thank you both for your statements. And let me just say that I think you have reached the right balance here in terms of talking about the direction we should go. I think we all want everybody to fully participate and we want to get people registered and give them that opportunity. But we want to make sure that we have fair elections without fraud, and that is really the way to go.

Two of the issues in New Mexico that I think are of some concern have to do with provisional ballots and absentee ballots. And I notice across the country, we are seeing the same thing. When you get into the area of how you make sure that absentees are handled in such a way that it is uniform and, as the Supreme Court would say, you had equal protection in these kinds of situations, that is a concern. And then the provisional ballots are also growing to a significant degree. I hope that you have an opportunity to

225 comment on both of those and give us some guidance as to where you think we should 226 head. 227 Once again, I think the chairman is right-on in holding this hearing and proceeding 228 on this, and I anxiously await the testimony of our very distinguished panel. 229 Thank you, Chairman Schumer. 230 **Chairman Schumer**. Thank you for your excellent statement, Senator Udall. 231 Now we are ready for the witnesses. I am going to briefly introduce each one, ask 232 them to each put their entire statement in the record, speak for five minutes, and then we 233 will have time for questions. So if you could try to tailor your remarks to meet the 234 five-minute goal, we would appreciate it. 235 First, Stephen Ansolabehere -- I know that is a hard one to say -- is a professor of 236 government at Harvard University and political science at MIT. Formerly, he served as 237 co-director of the Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project. He is an expert on American 238 elections, public opinion and voting behavior. 239 Curtis Gans is the director of the Center for the Study of the American Electorate 240 within the Center for Democracy and Election Management at American University. In 241 addition to being a professor at American University, he often appears as a recognized 2.42 expert on talk shows to discuss a variety of voting issues. 243 Nathaniel Persily is a professor at Columbia Law School. He is a nationally 244 recognized expert on election law and is the founder and director of the Center for Law and 245 Politics at Columbia Law School. 246 The Honorable Chris Nelson. Mr. Nelson has been serving as South Dakota's 247 Secretary of State since his election in 2002. Before being elected to this position, 248 Secretary Nelson served as South Dakota's state election supervisor. 249 Kristen Clarke is co-director of the Political Participation Group at the NAACP 250 Legal Defense and Education Fund. Before joining the NAACP, Ms. Clarke worked for 251 the Civil Rights Division at the U.S. Department of Justice. 252 Last but not least, Mr. Jonah Goldman. Mr. Goldman is director of the National 253 Campaign for Fair Elections at the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights. His 254 responsibilities include leadership in the Election Protection Coalition, the National 255 Network for State Election Reform, and the Lawyers' Committee election reform advocacy 256 and litigation docket.

257	Mr. Ansolabehere, Professor, thank you. And, again, your entire statements are
258	introduced into the record, so you may begin.
259	STATEMENT OF STEPHEN ANSOLABEHERE, PROFESSOR,
260	DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT, HARVARD UNIVERSITY
261	Mr. Ansolabehere. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee,
262	for holding this hearing and paying attention to this issue.
263	In 2001, the Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project found that 4 to 6 million
264	Americans tried to vote but could not, or did not have their votes recorded, owing to
265	problems with voting equipment, registration, absentee balloting and polling place
266	operations. The largest of these problems was registration followed closely by voting
267	technology.
268	The Help America Vote Act facilitated the upgrading of voting technology
269	throughout the United States, punch card and lever machines were phased out, and the
270	Federal Government assisted states and counties with their purchase of optical scan and
271	electronic voting equipment.
272	Voting technology accounted for about 1.5 to 2 million lost votes in 2000, and
273	today that figure appears to be around 500,000. That is a substantial improvement thanks
274	to the intervention of the Help America Vote Act. That is the good news.
275	Registration, unfortunately, remains as large a problem as ever. In 2008, to put the
276	matter in perspective, there were 230 million people of voting age in the United States, an
277	estimated 212 million eligible voters, that is citizens, non-felons who are also voting age,
278	an estimated 168 million registered voters, and 133 million people who actually voted.
279	To put matters another way, 44 million Americans were not registered to vote, though they
280	could have been, and another 35 million Americans were registered to vote but did not
281	vote.
282	The registration and authentication system in the United States remains a
283	significant source of difficulty for many voters. Of the 79 million Americans who are
284	eligible but did not vote, most certainly did not vote because they chose not to vote for lack
285	of interest. Even still, administrative problems prevented or discouraged millions of
286	Americans from voting.
287	Based on the results of the Cooperative Congressional Election Study, which
288	Senator Schumer discussed, I project that 9 million Americans did not vote because they

had recently moved or because the date for registering to vote had already passed and they were not registered. Two to 4 million Americans were discouraged from attempting to vote because of various administrative problems relating to the authentication of voters and registration, and another 2 to 3 million Americans were registered to vote, attempted to vote, but could not vote because of problems with registration, acquiring absentee ballots, or voter identification. All totaled, it appears that 4 to 7 million Americans could not vote, even though they attempted to vote or wished to vote in the 2008 election.

There are other chronic problems as well related to the system, especially accessibility of the system for the disabled and for military personnel, and there are emerging problems, especially the growing number of people who have trouble getting absentee ballots. This is of particular note because absentee balloting is on the rise, especially in the American west. In 1972, roughly 5 percent of Americans voted with absentee ballots. In 2008, roughly 30 percent voted with absentee ballots.

My written testimony focuses on the problems associated with the system for voter registration and authentication. The conclusion is a discouraging one, as many of us in this community, both as scholars and policymakers, just a short while ago took major steps to improve these systems. Even still, many people encounter problems with voter registration and voter authentication today, and those problems appear to be as large as eight years ago.

Currently, the states are in the middle of a major upgrading of voter registration systems in the United States begun under the Help America Vote Act. Some have completed this process but many have not. Most communities have yet to see the benefits of those systems, but there is certainly the possibility, as statewide registration systems are implemented properly, we may eventually observe the gains in registration systems similar to what occurred with voting technology.

Based on my experience over the past eight years, I fully believe that a cooperative effort of local election officers, secretaries of state and the federal government can reduce, substantially, the difficulties that millions of Americans encounter when trying to register and vote. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Ansolabehere follows:]

Chairman Schumer. Thank you, Professor, and thank you for your excellent report as well. We are honored that you released it at the committee.

	11
321	Mr. Gans?
322	
323	STATEMENT OF CURTIS GANS, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF
324	THE AMERICAN ELECTORATE
325	Mr. Gans. I want to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member for,
326	a) holding this hearing and, b) inviting me to participate in your deliberations. Anything I
327	say here will not reflect on the men and women who run our elections, the secretaries of
328	states and chief election officers, down to the people who man the polls on election night.
329	They are all decent, they all want to help, both with the integrity and the voting process.
330	I agree strongly with both the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member as to what
331	the purpose of our election law ought to be. It ought to maximize voter participation, it
332	ought to maximize the integrity of the process, and it ought to maximize citizen faith in that
333	process.
334	I am going to give you three sets of numbers that say we are a long way from that.
335	One is 74 and 50. A ballpark estimate of the percentage of eligible Americans is
336	74 percent, and that in turn means that there are 50 million Americans who are not
337	registered and cannot vote.
338	The second I am going to have to read. It is 115, 104.2, 103.6, 100.3, which is the
339	number of namesthe percentage of names on the registration list of the eligible voters in
340	the District of Columbia, Alaska, Illinois and South Dakota. Ten other states have
341	registration lists of 95 to 100 percent. And if anybody believes those numbers, there is a
342	bridge across the East River in the state of our chairman that I would like to sell you.
343	There are at least 20 million names on the registration list who should not be there, who
344	have died or moved or are not legitimate voters.
345	The last set of figures is 139 and 172. The United States ranks 139th out of 172
346	democracies in the world. That is not a great picture of a voting system that works.
347	We also have each year a series of problems, voter lists that do not contain names
348	that should, do contain names that should not be on them, zealous registration people on the

We have millions of dollars spent for people like Jonah to monitor elections for poll watches and for lawyers willing to move at the drop of a hat to challenge any deviation.

liberal side putting people on lists that should not be, zealous people on the other side

discarding registrations of people that do not agree with them.

349

350

351

We call it fraud and we call it intimidation and suppression, and all of them have a grain of truth.

We will not, so long as we have a list based system, remedy any of these problems fully. We should consider what has worked in Mexico. And what has worked in Mexico is a government provided and paid for national, mandatory, biometric identification card and system. That would enfranchise everybody who is eligible, and it would get rid of every one of the problems people have raised with the electoral system, except vote buying and election administration malfeasance.

The objections to those are money and privacy. This will cost \$14 billion. We do not do \$14 billion for our voting system, but we do it for national defense, and it could be justified on national defense because we should know who is coming into the country and who is in the country. And if we establish it, it would eliminate or reduce identity theft. It would provide for accurate census without enumeration. It could help with criminal prosecution and wrongful conviction exoneration. It could do a variety of things except get rid of the common cold and halitosis. It also would rationalize the various identity systems that are already being mandated or in place.

This is a far-out idea, but I think people ought to consider it because I think it is the way that we can actually deal with all of these problems.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Gans follows:]

Chairman Schumer. I thank our witnesses for both interesting, informative testimony within the time limit, two out of two.

Professor Persily?

STATEMENT OF NATHANIEL PERSILY, PROFESSOR, COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL

Mr. Persily. Let me echo the thanks of my fellow witnesses to this committee. It is always a pleasure to be an election law professor who is giving testimony not in the middle of a meltdown, and it gives us a chance to think in a sober way about some of these problems that we have already been discussing.

I just want to make three brief points, and I have given you longer testimony for the record. First I want to look at the effect of registration laws on turnout, and then, secondly, to look at registration problems that we saw on Election Day. And then, finally,

to talk a little bit about the litigation as a description of the magnitude of the registration problem.

First, the effect of registration on turnout. The effect of registration on turnout is not simply by the registration system itself. The United States continues to make it more difficult than any other industrialized democracy to vote. And the reason is not because we simply have registration; other countries have registration. It is the combination of that registration system with the high mobility of our population and the fact that the government does not take an affirmative role in registering people to vote. Those are the factors that make the United States unique. The incredible mobility of the U.S. population is one of the chief reasons that we see relatively low voter turnout.

To give you some sense of the relationship between the variables: 90 million eligible voters move every five years. All of those voters, if they want to vote at their new address, assuming they are not in an EDR state, have to take an affirmative step in order to register to vote. It is not a surprise, then, that people who have lived in their residence for five years or more turn out at rates of about 75 percent. Those who are recent movers to a new state or new county: only about half of those people tend to turn out to vote.

But the effect of mobility, or the combination of mobility and registration laws, is not seen just in the aggregate numbers. You can see it on discrete populations, and several members of this committee have already mentioned military voters. Congress has spent a lot of time looking at uniformed and overseas voters in this context because of the problems that those voters face.

You can also get a sense of this--and this is also from Steven Ansolabehere's Cooperative Congressional Election Survey, which is the effect on military voters even inside the United States, who face registration problems and voting problems at a higher rate than the general population. And that is because they are more likely to be moving before Election Day than the average population.

Most political scientists have spent a lot of time looking at the discrete effects on low-income groups, or particularly the relationship of registration laws on education. But when we look, for example, at these military voters who experience about 1.7 times the rate of registration problems when they go and attempt to vote and that also turn out at a rate 10 percent lower than the general population, we get a sense of the nature of this problem.

Secondly, let me talk a little bit about the registration problems at the polls in this

past election. Unfortunately, we do not have the kind of concrete data that we would really like in order to assess the magnitude of the problems in this past election. We know, for example, that between 20 and 31 percent of the election related incidents that happened at the polls this year were registration related. You can get a sense of that from, say, the CNN incident reports or some of the other incident reports that different election protection organizations were running.

We know, for example, that in the 2004 election, that 1.9 million provisional ballots were cast and that the secretaries of state say that the chief reason behind the non-counting of a third of those provisional ballots was because of a registration problem.

We only really have data now from about 14 states on the rate of provisional ballot usage in the 2008 election, but we even know from just those 14 states that 800,000 provisional ballots were cast. And that gives you some glimpse as to the possibility of the relationship of the registration problem to the number of provisional ballots.

Then, finally, let me talk a little bit about the litigation in this past election. This is sort of a statement against interest because this is how we election law professors make our living. Let me talk about three categories of litigation that happened in this election, all related to this problem that you are investigating here today.

The first is what I think was the most common form of litigation, at least during this election cycle, and that was lawsuits dealing with purges and mismatch lists when you compare the voter registration lists to some other lists, whether it is drivers licenses, social security lists, et cetera, where you found a dramatic number of mismatches.

The second is the very famous now set of cases dealing with third-party registration drives, the kind that Senator Bennett was talking about, dealing with ACORN and some of these other groups that allegedly had registered voters who did not exist.

Then the final type of litigation that we saw were sort of the garden variety registration lawsuits, those cases where there is a technical defect in registrations or that there are problems such that people do not get to vote.

Between the litigation and the voter turnout and these registration problems at the polls, I think we get a sense at least the magnitude of the problem in the 2008 election.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Persily follows:]

Chairman Schumer. Thank you again. Excellent testimony.

448 Mr. Nelson?

449

477

478

479

480

voter.

450 STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CHRIS NELSON, SECRETARY OF 451 STATE, STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA 452 **Mr. Nelson.** Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, it is truly a privilege to 453 be before this committee and I appreciate the opportunity. I think it is vital that you hear 454 from the perspective of a state election official. 455 November 4, 2008 was a historic day in America; nearly 133 million cast their 456 vote. That is 9 million more than voted in 2004 and 25 million more than voted in the 457 Year 2000. Voter registration systems across this country, managed by state and local 458 election officials, handled that increase in registration and turnout, and they stand ready to 459 handle future increases in registration and turnout. 460 I want to spend just a few moments talking about what I believe is right about our 461 current voter registration system. The purpose of that system, obviously, is to provide a 462 list of those eligible to vote in each precinct. Voter registration provides order to our 463 election system. I believe there are nine elements in our system that are crucial, and I 464 would like to visit briefly about each one of those. They contribute to the reliability of the 465 system. 466 Number 1. Voter registration is easy and accessible. Voter registration is 467 available at election offices, driver license agencies, public assistance agencies, other 468 public agencies, military recruitment offices, and on the Internet. 469 Number 2. The system relies on a paper card or form that is signed by the voters. 470 Questions about the accuracy of the system can be taken back to that original registration 471 card. Much has been talked about having a paper trail of the ballot on Election Day. It is 472 equally important that we have a paper trail of the voter registration process with each 473 person that registers. 474 Number 3. The registration card contains an oath which must be signed by the citizen, swearing to their eligibility and their citizenship. State and local officials have 475 very little access to citizenship information. We rely heavily on the oath signed by the 476

Number 4. The voter registration system is local. Voter registration cards are maintained as official records at the local agency. Those local officials know that each of those registrations represent somebody's right to vote, and if there is information that is

481 missing on those cards, local officials do everything they can to get that resolved. 482 Number 5. Voter registration data is verified. The Help America Vote Act 483 requires verification against drivers license lists or social security data. Incorrect 484 information or simple typos can be caught and easily corrected. 485 Number 6. Voter registration is aggregated into a statewide voter registration file 486 that assists us in eliminating duplicate voter registrations. It also allows states, such as 487 South Dakota, to use that data to allow citizens to, through the Internet, verify their 488 registration status, find their polling place, and view their sample ballot. 489 Number 7. The current registration system establishes a chain of responsibility for 490 that data. Local officials know where to find the original registration information, they 491 know how the data is incorporated into the registration file, they know how that file is used 492 to create the precinct registration lists, and with that knowledge, they can track down and 493 answer questions about why someone is on the list or is not on the list. 494 Number 8. The voter registration system is transparent. The public, the 495 candidates, the media, the political parties understand how names are added to the list and 496 how names are removed from the list. And I would suggest that any attempt to remove 497 that transparency from the current system will create and lead to deep suspicion about the 498 integrity of the system. 499 Number 9. Voter registration is part of the fabric of our American political 500 system. The requirement for voters to be registered causes political parties and other 501 groups to do voter registration drives. Those drives heighten the awareness about the 502 upcoming election, and I believe that is good. 503 The voter registration system in America today is the best and cleanest that it has

The voter registration system in America today is the best and cleanest that it has ever been, despite some of the issues that we have heard about. The nine elements that I have talked about play an important part in our successful registration system. The removal of any one of these elements risks the integrity of the system.

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

With rights come responsibilities. In the area of voter registration, state and local election officials have the responsibility of maintaining an accurate and clean election registration list. Individual citizens have the simple but powerful responsibility of filling out a voter registration card to avail themselves of their right to vote. It is a system that works and works well.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, thank you again for this opportunity

513	and your consideration.
514	[The prepared statement of Mr. Nelson follows:]
515	Chairman Schumer. Thank you very, very much, Mr. Nelson. Again, I think
516	excellent outline.
517	Ms. Clarke?
518	
519	STATEMENT OF KRISTEN CLARKE, CO-DIRECTOR, POLITICAL
520	PARTICIPATION GROUP, NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE FUND AND
521	EDUCATIONAL FUND
522	Ms. Clarke. Chairman and distinguished members of the Committee, thank you
523	for the opportunity to come and speak with you today about some of the problems that
524	continues to plague our nation's voter registration system.
525	The final data that emerged in the 2008 election cycle reveals that only 61 percent
526	of Americans eligible to vote cast ballots in this historic election. That is 1 percent more
527	than in 2004. LDF believes that many more people would have liked to participate and we
528	should undertake to see that in future elections they have the opportunity to do so.
529	Almost 13 percent of all eligible voters in our country are not registered at present.
530	If we are to be regarded as the world's leading democracy, we must work to fix the breaks
531	in the system and ensure that we reach the millions of eligible but not yet registered voters
532	who are locked out of the system. I want to take my time to highlight some of the key
533	problems by focusing on some of the issues and problems happening on the ground.
534	First, purge programs and unreliable database matching systems have created
535	enormous obstacles for voters. As states have moved to implement the requirements of
536	the Help America Vote Act, we are witnessing the technological advancements themselves
537	being used and abused to match and remove voters from registration lists.
538	Let me point to an example. A recent purge program carried out in Louisiana
539	resulted in a purge program that matched voters by using interstate databases to compare
540	the first name, last name and date of birth of Louisiana voters with individuals from other
541	states. Predictably, the system proved unreliable, yielding a number of false matches.
542	And at the end of the day, more than 12,000 voters were purged from the state's rolls. A
543	significant number of them were African American voters, many of them impacted by
544	Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

The study confirmed that these kinds of matching programs are extremely error prone and not based on sufficiently unique criteria that would prevent voter disenfranchisement. Most purge programs like Louisiana's disregard the fail-safe provisions that are built into the National Voter Registration Act that generally require election officials to give proper notice and wait two federal election cycles before striking voters from the rolls.

In addition, poorly designed state voter registration applications and arbitrary rules by local election officials also pose a substantial threat. During our advocacy efforts this election cycle, we identified a number of jurisdictions in which officials rejected registration applications for reasons that have no bearing whatsoever on eligibility. Immaterial omissions often resulted in a number of the rejections.

In Indiana, for example, election officials were directed to reject registration applications if an applicant failed to mark a check box confirming their citizenship or their voting age. This was done despite the fact that voters sign an affirmation under penalty of perjury at the bottom of the form confirming that they are citizens and confirming that they are of voting age. These actions prompted successful litigation to stop officials from acting on these grounds, but the problem continues.

Another example emerges out of Alabama where the Secretary of State instructed local election officials to reject applications from persons who possess drivers licenses but chose instead to list the social security number of the voter registration form. Thus, voters who provided a social security number were rejected for not listing their drivers license number when registering.

The take away here is that voters should not penalized for poorly designed voter registration applications that capture duplicative information from applicants. We need to streamline the design of registration applications and eliminate the game of gotcha that leads to the rejection of so many would-be voters.

Another example emerges out of Louisiana where officials reported rejecting as much as 20 percent of new registration applications because a database match revealed inconsistencies with the spelling of a name or in the full drivers license or social security number. Potential voters should not be penalized for administrative errors like these that have no bearing on voter eligibility.

The challenge we now face is determining how to reform and repair the system in a

577	way that will be more inclusive and provide opportunities for broad and meaningful
578	participation for the millions of eligible but not yet registered citizens among us. While
579	we turn now to corrective action, we must remain mindful of the particular challenges
580	faced by those who are among the most vulnerable among us, the poor and our nation's
581	racial and ethnic minorities. The future of American democracy remains tied to our
582	ability to resolve some of the barriers that I have discussed today. Thank you.
583	[The prepared statement of Ms. Clarke follows:]
584	Chairman Schumer. An exquisite sense of timing. You ended exactly at five
585	minutes.
586	Ms. Clarke. Thank you.
587	Chairman Schumer. Mr. Goldman?
588	And you gave very good testimony, more importantly.
589	
590	STATEMENT OF JONAH GOLDMAN, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CAMPAIGN
591	FOR FAIR ELECTIONS
592	Mr. Goldman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am a little bit intimidated by the
593	example. I will make sure that I am inside the five minutes also.
594	I want to thank you and Senator Bennett also for not only bringing this hearing
595	together, as Professor Persily said, at a time when it is not in the middle of an election
596	cycle, but when we have the opportunity to deliberate on these really important issues,
597	which are policy issues and not political issues.
598	As you suggested, our voter registration system needs modernization. At the
599	dawn of the 19th century, long before Alexander Graham Bell made the first phone call, as
600	you suggested, Mr. Chairman, the Whig Party was first advocating for our current voter
601	registration system. And despite whether there are or there are not currently Whigs
602	around, we know one thing, that both the registration system and the Whig Party are relics
603	of the past.
604	Our registration system is inefficient. It sets election officials up for failure by
605	diverting resources and energy from crucial tasks and it prevents more eligible voters from
606	casting a ballot than any other part of the election process.

As governments at all levels fight to stretch every penny, this Congress has

recognized that streamlining essential process is critical for moving forward in this new

607

economy. Counties and states across the country are wasting millions of dollars every election cycle administering an outdated and expensive paper-based voter registration process that puts our election system at risk. Modernizing the registration system will improve democracy and allow communities to reinvest resources in critical functions like keeping more teachers in the classroom and more cops on the street.

There are two culprits, paper and timing. Each registration requires an individual paper form. A third to a half of these forms arrive in registrars' offices just before the deadline. The inefficiency of the registration system has a domino effect, causing confusion at the polls and infecting every aspect of the voting process.

The biggest impact is on voters. We have already heard up to 9 million voters are prevented from voting at one stage or another because of the registration process. Registration problems affect everyone, but also, as we have heard already, it is felt more distinctly in some communities. Military and overseas voters have terrible access to registration facilities. Older voters and those with disabilities cannot get absentee ballots unless registration rules are updated. And young voters are frequently left off rolls because they move often but also because they are unfamiliar with the process.

The current system of voter registration is a bureaucratic nightmare. In an election system with more than 7,000 local election offices, just getting the paper application to the right place is no small feat.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, in your state of New York, for example, a hundred thousand forms collected by third-party registration groups were mistakenly sent to the State Board of Elections in Albany. The board had to sort through those forms and forward them to the correct local offices. Some 3,500 of those forms were found in the New York City Elections Office after Election Day. Of course, those voters were not on the registration list.

Registration deadlines have caused significant issues. Adam, an active serviceman from Mississippi, submitted his registration before the deadline as he was leaving for his tour. When he came home, there was no record of his registration, the deadline had passed, and he could not vote.

Purges often have removed long-time voters from registration rolls. James, he had been voting at the same poll location in Alabama for decades, but when he got to the polls on Election Day, he was told that he was not registered. An election official told him that

his office had received calls from about 20 other voters who had similar problems. These experiences were shared by countless voters across the country.

Through Election Protection, I have had the honor to interact with hundreds of talented election officials. In jurisdictions of all sizes, whether run by Republicans, Democrats or nonpartisan professionals, the story remains the same. The inefficiencies of the registration system are a fundamental concern because they undermine election officials' ability to effectively serve their voters.

All that manual data entry cost money and adds opportunities from the states. Often more than half the registration budget goes to hiring temporary employees and assigning full-time staff to capture information from handwritten applications and eliminate duplicate registrations. This process costs even small jurisdictions, like Forsyth County, Georgia, hundreds of thousands of dollars. The cost grows to over a million dollars in medium sized jurisdictions like Franklin County, Ohio and is a multimillion dollar endeavor in large counties like Los Angeles.

Even with these extraordinary measures and costs, the system is far from foolproof. Voters can show up at the polls and find their name has been wrongly entered or dropped, forcing them to cast, as we have heard before, provisional ballots. Election officials then must reconcile the mistake by using other data to identify the voter before counting the ballot, which adds further costs and delayed certification.

These costs have a debilitating effect on the rest of the election system. For example, in Columbia, Ohio, the Board of Elections stopped notifying registrations with incomplete applications of the opportunity to correct them because it just cost too much. Even then, as Matt Damschroder who oversees elections in Franklin County says, phones that would otherwise be picked up are not, leaving voters' questions unanswered. Because of the inherent delays in processing paper registration forms, Los Angeles has to spend \$56,000 in every countywide election to send supplemental voter rosters to poll inspectors by overnight mail. That delay makes it difficult to order and distribute ballots.

Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for all you are doing to move us towards a more efficient and equitable process to exercise our vote. Each election in the voter registration system, this relic of our pre-Civil War past, blocks millions of Americans from casting a ballot, distracts election officials, and needlessly wastes millions of dollars at a time when state and local budgets are stretching every penny. Congress has the power and the

673 opportunity to modernize this antiquated system. Thank you for taking the first step 674 today. [The prepared statement of Mr. Goldman follows:] 675 676 Chairman Schumer. Good job, Mr. Goldman; seven seconds off. Not bad, not 677 too shabby, given how it usually is around here. 678 Okay. I want to thank the six witnesses. I thought the testimony was excellent 679 from the witnesses that I asked to come and that Senator Bennett asked to come, and very 680 much appreciated. 681 Now, to me, the astounding fact here was the reports both by Professors 682 Ansolabehere and Persily, that large numbers of people just could not vote. And this is 683 not relegated to a state; it shows the problems are everywhere. And I am certainly mindful 684 of what Mr. Nelson said, that there is a lot that works with the system. Most people do 685 vote and vote well, but in democracy, everybody has to vote. 686 So I would like to ask the witnesses whether they agree, each of you, just with the 687 statement that we have substantial numbers of eligible voters being excluded from the 688 rolls. It is a simple statement. I will just ask each of you for a yes or no answer, and then 689 I am going to let anybody say whatever they wish. Okay? Go ahead, Mr. Ansolabehere. 690 691 Mr. Ansolabehere. Yes. **Chairman Schumer**. Mr. Gans? 692 Mr. Gans. Yes. 693 **Chairman Schumer**. Mr. Persily? 694 Mr. Persily. Yes. 695 **Chairman Schumer**. Mr. Nelson? 696 Mr. Nelson. No. 697 698 **Chairman Schumer**. Ms. Clarke? Ms. Clarke. Absolutely. 699 Mr. Goldman. Yes. 700 701 Chairman Schumer. Okay. Then we will first ask Mr. Nelson. You disagree 702 with the other five witnesses. You think that--do you think--I mean, I guess explain. 703 Their studies are pretty good. They are not biased or political, so explain to me your

answer. I am not asking the percentage. I am asking just that we have, at least by their

705 reports, in the millions of people who are eligible to vote, want to vote and cannot. 706 **Mr. Nelson.** I do not believe that anybody is excluded. There are obviously 707 millions that have been testified to that are not on the list for various reasons, but I do not 708 believe that we have a system that purposely excludes anybody. 709 **Chairman Schumer**. Oh, I agree with that. 710 **Mr. Nelson.** And are there issues within the system that need to be looked at and 711 addressed? Absolutely. And there are a number of things that have been brought up here 712 that I would love to question the witnesses on because they do not make sense with what I 713 know about how the system works. 714 **Chairman Schumer**. But the instance of, say, the military solider who was 715 assigned, wants to vote, and did not. Now, the system is not purposely excluding him. 716 And Ms. Clarke focused on Louisiana and Georgia, and there are allegations that some of 717 these rules are done to deliberately exclude people. 718 But let's leave that aside. Let's assume that we are not talking about intent here. 719 We are just talking about the fact that the way the system works that there are people who 720 want to vote, try to do what they can to vote, but cannot. You do not disagree with that. 721 **Mr. Nelson.** There may be some. But let me use your example of the military 722 voter--723 Chairman Schumer. Sure. 724 **Mr. Nelson.** --that is transferred on October 15th to a new location, gets to their 725 new location too late to register. They can certainly vote absentee prior to leaving their 726 current location. They are opened to do that in any state. 727 Chairman Schumer. Well--728 **Mr. Nelson.** So they are not excluded from the process. 729 **Chairman Schumer.** You know, I have voted by absentee ballot. It is not so 730 easy. You have to call--you have to get the form from the election board. It sometimes 731 takes a long period of time. It is cumbersome. And in New York, I think we have a 732 pretty good absentee ballot system. 733 You also have--the example I gave is the soldier is told--let's just say he is 734 registered to vote, or she is registered to vote, at the military base in which they live. On 735 October 15th, they are told they have to be somewhere else by November 1st, and the

736

deadline for absentee ballots is over.

737 **Mr. Nelson.** If I might--738 **Chairman Schumer.** We do not have--every state, am I correct, does not allow people to decide to vote absentee within a week or two. You sometimes have to apply for 739 740 that absentee ballot in advance. 741 **Mr. Nelson.** I am not aware of any state that would have a two-week restriction 742 on absentee balloting. In South Dakota you can absentee vote up until 3:00 on election 743 day. I am not aware of any state that has a two-week black out. 744 **Chairman Schumer.** I am not sure, but somebody check me. In New York, you 745 have to apply for the absentee ballot in advance. 746 Is that right? 747 Professor Persily, you are from New York. 748 **Mr. Persily.** I cannot remember exactly what it was in New York. I should say 749 that I tried to vote and I was actually told I was not on the registration list only two years 750 ago in New York. And it was the night before the election official--having an election law 751 professor be the one being turned away from voting. 752 But with respect to absentee ballots, there are several states where, first of all, you 753 have to have cause, obviously, in some states to request an absentee ballot. And there is 754 huge variety on different states. 755 **Chairman Schumer**. Yes. I think, in all due respect, Mr. Nelson, there are 756 states that would not allow that military voter to vote; not through intent, but in others. 757 Mr. Goldman, would you sum up--tell us the restrictions on that particular 758 situation? I know you have studied this a lot. 759 **Mr. Goldman.** Absolutely, and thank you, Mr. Chairman. 760 I think that we all do agree that, generally, a system that was created in the 19th century was created in a way that should be fair. The problem is that it was created in 761 762 the 19th century when there were horse and buggies dragging folks from place to place to 763 try to register voters; now we are on learjets. And I think that its something that we 764 need to understand, is that we are really talking about a 21st century political process in a 765 19th century system that, as you say, is the lifeblood of the process. 766 The voters who call us are voters who want to vote. They want to vote 767 desperately. And in 2008, we received 240,000 calls. Over 300,000 more people were

serviced by Election Protection through our Web site. And they were telling us stories,

769 military voters, telling us about how they--770 **Chairman Schumer.** So the example that I gave is not an unusual--or is not an 771 out of the question one, right? 772 **Mr. Goldman.** No, it is not unusual at all. 773 **Chairman Schumer**. It probably happens hundreds of times. 774 **Mr. Goldman.** Sure. It happens--775 **Chairman Schumer**. At least hundreds, probably more. 776 **Mr. Goldman.** It happens more than hundreds of times. We get those calls from 777 all over the country, from service members who have moved, who are transferred right at 778 the end of the deadline. But also, as I suggested in the testimony, from service members 779 who register before the deadline as they are supposed to, and then come home from their 780 tour of duty to get to the polling place excited to, as you suggested, vote for their boss, their 781 commander and chief, and get to the polling place and their names are not on the rolls. 782 **Chairman Schumer**. Right. 783 Let me just ask, before I turn it over to my friend and colleague, Senator Bennett, to 784 both Mr. Persily and Mr. Ansolabehere--because I do think while there is bad intent 785 maybe, there are some people on either side, some who want to exclude people from 786 voting, some who want to falsely register people. 787 But would it be right to say that most of the people who are excluded are not 788 excluded by intent, by design, but rather because of the cumbersomeness of the system, the 789 system is not modernized and things like that? 790 Do you agree with that, Professor Persily? 791 **Mr. Persily.** I do. 792 **Chairman Schumer**. How about you? Does your study show that? 793 **Mr. Ansolabehere.** Yes, and other studies we have conducted. 794 **Chairman Schumer**. Would you disagree with that, Ms. Clarke? 795 **Ms. Clarke.** No, I agree with that. I think that--part of the problem is that 796 election officials have too much discretion, and they abuse that discretion, or you have a 797 case in South Dakota where it appears that Mr. Nelson enforces rules very liberally and 798 other states where similar rules are enforced in a very restrictive manner that locks voters 799 out.

We need to figure out a way to make these rules more uniform across the board.

801	Chairman Schumer. But you would agree there is not a grand conspiracy on
802	either side. There are some people who have bad intent, but mostly this occurs because
803	we have not modernized or are just negligent. There are new examples that keep coming
804	up that we do not realize.
805	Is that fair?
806	Ms. Clarke. I agree with that.
807	Chairman Schumer. Senator Bennett?
808	Senator Bennett. Thank you very much, and thank you all for your excellent
809	testimony. I do have some quibbles here and there that I would like to do my best to deal
810	with.
811	Mr. Goldman, stop talking about a 19th century system. We have changed it. I
812	had to fill out a provisional ballot in Utah, and in the 19th century there were no provisional
813	ballots. I had applied for an absentee ballot and forgot it. So I showed up at the polls and
814	they said, you cannot vote because you have already voted absentee. I said, well, I never
815	mailed it in. Okay. You come over here, fill out a provisional ballot and we will see.
816	That is a system that is not in the 19th century. There have been an awful lot of
817	changes in this. So you have valid points. Do not diminish their validity by that kind of
818	pejorative statement.
819	Chairman Schumer. But just to quibble with my good friend, in the first half of
820	the 19th century, nobody voted in Utah.
821	[Laughter.]
822	Senator Bennett. That is true. We were infested with Mormon crickets, if I
823	could use another term that has been in the news.
824	Mr. Ansolabehere, I would like to know more about your methodology because we
825	have had a lot of numbers thrown out here. You use the number 7 million. In your
826	written testimony, you are talking about 4 to 5 million who could not or did not vote.
827	Mr. Goldman said 9 million. Mr. Persily said we do not have concrete data.
828	We are using numbers, and in Washington the tendency is, once a number is thrown
829	out, regardless of how tentative it may be, it gets locked in. The press picks it up; it ends
830	up in a headline. Having been in the headline, it then ends up in a bunch of speeches and it
831	becomes gospel.
832	Right now, you are the only source that I can find, and I would like to understand

833	your methodology a little better. You talk about 33,000 respondents. I want to know
834	how that sample was drawn and how it was verified. And all of your extrapolations come
835	from those 33,000; is that correct?
836	Mr. Ansolabehere. I followed two methods. One isI also followwe have the
837	survey that we did in fall of '08, which is the only publicly available survey at this moment.
838	The other survey that we are waiting on is the Current Population Survey that the Census
839	produces. We follow the Current Population census' methodology in terms of question
840	design and also the methodology for projecting from the survey out to figures on total
841	number
842	Senator Bennett. I am sure you do. I am more interested in the sample.
843	Mr. Ansolabehere. The sample was part Internet and part phone to validate.
844	And we also validated the study by comparing the statements of how many people voted
845	for each candidate against the total vote shares that those candidates received in every state.
846	And all of the states, except one, were within the margin of error, and the one was Kansas.
847	So there was something about the sample in that state. But that will happen sometimes.
848	Senator Bennett. Whom did you go after? How did you know to call 33,000
849	people? Were they self-selected?
850	Mr. Ansolabehere. It is a national random sample. In some sense, all surveys
851	are self-selected because all surveys are voluntary. But, yes, national random sample of
852	the population in the United States, the adult population in the United States.
853	Senator Bennett. You called them? And how many of the 33,000 you called
854	said I did not have any problem and lived in South Dakota?
855	Mr. Ansolabehere. How many of the 33,000 said I did not have any problem?
856	Senator Bennett. Yes.
857	Mr. Ansolabehere. Well, let's focus on the 4 to 5 million number. So the 4 to
858	5 million are the number of people projected out from the survey who said that they had
859	tried to vote but could not, for whatever reason.
860	Senator Bennett. I understand that, but you are talking 33,000 people. What
861	percentage of them lived in Mr. Nelson's state and said they had no problem?
862	Mr. Ansolabehere. I do not know how many in South Dakota.
863	Senator Bennett. No, I am not saying specifically South Dakota, but what
864	percent said they had no problem?

865	Mr. Ansolabehere. What percent said they had no problem? Probably about
866	96 percent said they had no problem.
867	Senator Bennett. So you are extrapolatinglet's say 4 percent of the 33,000, of
868	the 4 percent, you are extrapolating the 7 million figure you gave us here.
869	Mr. Ansolabehere. Right, and that is about what Census does when they do the
870	Current Population Survey projection as well.
871	The Current Population Survey, when you look at the statistical abstract of the
872	United States or the reports produced by CPS through the Census Bureau, give you
873	projections for how many million people are registered. That is where the number
874	142 million people registered comes from, from the last election cycle and so forth. That
875	is where they get the citizens voting age population numbers. There is no official record
876	of how many citizens there are in the United States; it all comes from those surveys.
877	Senator Bennett. Oh, I understand that.
878	Can you not get the number registered by contacting all 50 states?
879	Mr. Ansolabehere. Actually, no you cannot. Even the National Association of
880	Secretaries of States produce a report, and all that was given from some states, like Texas,
881	were ballpark numbers.
882	Senator Bennett. Mr. Nelson, can you tell him how many are registered in your
883	state?
884	Mr. Nelson. Five hundred and thirty-three thousand.
885	Mr. Ansolabehere. Yes, some states you can, but you cannot get it in all
886	Senator Bennett. I will not pursue it any further.
887	Mr. Ansolabehere. On top of that, there are problems of duplications, which
888	South Dakota, as was testified, had more people on the rolls than they had in the citizens
889	voting age population. So there is an impossibility there, and it is just because people
890	move. There is no requirement that somebody update their registration.
891	Very quickly, as Nate testified, the registration lists become obsolete. Currently I
892	am doing a study in L.A. County where we are auditing the rolls there, and it looks like
893	about 6 to 10 percent of the names on the list, just the names, are no longer valid addresses.
894	In addition, there are another 10 percent where the registration seems to be incorrect,
895	according to the

Senator Bennett. Your written testimony suggests that there are 30 million

897	obsolete and duplicate answers on the list. And you agree that these 30 million should be
898	removed?
899	Mr. Ansolabehere. Something should be done to reduce them. I do not know
900	how to do that. That is I think an issue with how to do purges properly. I think there has
901	been huge improvements in the states since 2001.
902	Senator Bennett. Well, I do not want to drill any further on this or take more
903	time.
904	Mr. Gans, I am interested in your solution, which is basically calling for a national
905	ID card for everything, for social security, for immigration, for everything. And that is
906	probably a bigger issue than we are going to deal with here.
907	Chairman Schumer. My Ranking Member, I also chair the Immigration
908	Subcommittee. Who knows?
909	Senator Bennett. Okay.
910	Mr. Gans. Mr. Chairman, I have run this one by Doris Meissner, who sort of
911	likes it for the immigration purposes.
912	Senator Bennett. Yes.
913	Chairman Schumer. May I interrupt, Lindsey Graham and I put in a proposal for
914	a biometric social security card to deal with the immigration problem a couple of years ago.
915	So the two actually do dovetail. It gets opposition from a variety of places, but it also gets
916	some support.
917	Senator Bennett. Yes, both of those are true.
918	Just one lastyou are aware that in Australia, they solve this problem by making
919	voting mandatory. If you do not vote, you get fined.
920	Now, I do not quite know how they handle the lists, but this was brought home
921	dramatically when an Australian politician came to see me some years ago to talk about
922	strategies. And having been one who had run campaigns in Utah, I immediately said,
923	well, the first thing you have to do is identify who your voters are to get them out. And he
924	said, no, that is not a problem. I said, what do you mean that is not a problem? He said,
925	we have mandatory voting; everybody gets out.
926	I think the fine is 50 Australian dollars or something. I cannot remember. Do not
927	take that, if there is anybody noting this down, because that was a lot of years ago. But
928	when the Australians did some government reform some years ago, one of the reforms they

929 put in place was mandatory voting. 930 Does anybody have a reaction? 931 **Mr. Gans.** Yes, I do. 932 **Senator Bennett.** Okay. 933 **Mr. Gans.** I have two reactions. One reaction is that I think the right to vote 934 implies the right not to vote. And I also-three reactions. I also think if we boost the numbers, we will hide the problems. And the third thing is, even if you have mandatory 935 936 voting, you would still have a list that you have to make accurate. The thrust of my 937 testimony is essentially to start conceiving of another paradigm because otherwise you will 938 be in Rube Goldberg Number 27. 939 **Senator Bennett.** Okay. Well, I agree with you that the right to vote also 940 includes the right not to vote, and I am not advocating for the Australian system. And this 941 gets back to the question of extrapolating numbers; how many people did not vote because 942 they chose not to vote as opposed to an assumption that if they did not vote, it was because 943 of some breakdown in the system. 944 Now, Mr. Persily, you are nodding your head. Do you want to comment on that? 945 Mr. Persily. Well, let me first--since I have a little knowledge of Australia, I have 946 to at least give my two seconds on that, which is that although they have mandatory voting 947 there and they have fines, almost no one gets prosecuted, and yet the have extremely high 948 voter turnout. About 4 percent, I think, of the ballots are cast for no candidate. They are 949 called donkey ballots, which we would call undervotes here in the U.S. I guess here a 950 donkey ballot means something completely different. 951 **Chairman Schumer**. They should call them kangaroo ballots. 952 **Mr. Persily.** But one thing I think you are getting a sense of from the testimony 953 here is how much we do not know. I mean, we do have a good glimpse of, I think, the 954 problem, both through litigation, from the number of respondents who are saying they 955 faced problems, the number of people who call into these help lines, et cetera, and the 956 number of provisional ballots, which gives you a sense of the registration and voting gap. 957 So the first step here is to--we do not actually even know how many people voted in 958 this last election. We have 12 states that do not even provide certified vote totals. So you 959 hear this number 133 million bandied about. There is a significant margin of error even in

that. And then as previous witnesses were saying, with respect to the registration lists,

961	yes, there is going to be a gap between, say, 20 million people who are on the registration
962	rolls and the number of people who say that they are registered.
963	What we really need is to have a census of election administrators. We need to
964	know at the precinct level how many people vote for which candidates by which method,
965	military, Internet, provisional, et cetera, and then we can really get a handle on the scope of
966	all these problems.
967	Senator Bennett. And then we have the problem Mr. Gans talked about, where
968	there are more names on the lists than there are people living in the jurisdiction.
969	Mr. Persily. Yes.
970	Mr. Gans. We have that. And the other thing, in response to your question of
971	my colleague here, is whether you take my colleague's figure on my right or my figures, we
972	either have 44 million or 50 million people who are not registered who are citizens eligible
973	18 and over. And that is a problem, as is the problem of 20 million names that are on
974	registration rolls that should not be on. Both of those need to be dealt with.
975	Senator Bennett. Thank you all very much.
976	Chairman Schumer. Let me go to a second round. And, of course, I afford that
977	to my colleague.
978	Just one point, Mr. Nelson, just making the point of Mr. Ansolabehere here,
979	Professor, you said there were 533,000, did you say?
980	Mr. Nelson. Correct.
981	Chairman Schumer. How many total people are there in South Dakota?
982	Mr. Nelson. Adults, about 750.
983	Chairman Schumer. Adults?
984	Mr. Nelson. No, total population about 750.
985	Chairman Schumer. Right. So how many adults are there, 18 and over who are
986	citizens? I will bet it is less than 533.
987	Mr. Nelson. If I might address that because it was mentioned we have over a
988	hundred percent registration.
989	The percentage of registered voters on the active registration list is 87 percent.
990	The way they come up with the over 100 percent number is by adding in the inactive
991	registered voters, that inactive list. And I will tell you, when the National Voter
992	Registration Act was passed in 1993, the restrictions that it places on voter lists

993	maintenance, I said at that time, this is going to guarantee in excess of 100 percent
994	registration, and that is where we are at
995	Chairman Schumer. This illustrates the point I think that both Mr. Ansolabehere
996	and Mr. Gans were making.
997	Let me go back because my friend, Senator Bennett, talked about 4 million,
998	5 million. All those numbers are consistent. They represent different categories. So
999	would you justboth you and Professor Persily, Mr. Ansolabehere, just go over what each
1000	of those numbers represents. They are not inconsistent numbers; they are not just bandied
1001	about numbers. They are serious numbers based on a study, obviously, on statistical
1002	methods. But they are not inconsistent given those statistical methods.
1003	Go ahead.
1004	Mr. Ansolabehere. The 4 to 5 million number is based on the number of people
1005	in the survey, projected out based on the number of citizens voting age population who said
1006	that they tried to vote but failed, for whatever reason.
1007	Chairman Schumer. And they were registered.
1008	Mr. Ansolabehere. And they were registered.
1009	Chairman Schumer. Right. And give a couple of examples of those. Just give
1010	a couple of examples of those.
1011	Mr. Ansolabehere. Actually, I cannot say anything that is a specific example
1012	from the survey because it violates confidentiality
1013	Chairman Schumer. Well, you do not have to give the name; somebody who
1014	showed up, waited on line for two hours, and went home because it was pouring rain, right?
1015	Would that be
1016	Mr. Ansolabehere. Yes. There are people who went home because the lines
1017	were too long. There were people on that list who said they were sick or disabled, they
1018	had transportation problems, they were out of town and so forth.
1019	Chairman Schumer. Okay.
1020	Mr. Ansolabehere. The 4 to 5 million is the percentagesorry. The 2 to
1021	3 million of those people, that 4 to 5 million, said that they could not vote because of lack
1022	of registration, because they had requested an absentee ballot but did not receive one, or
1023	because they were asked for voter identification and they did not have it. That is the two
1024	to three.

1025	Then there is an additional set of people who did not try to vote but said, when they
1026	were asked why you did not vote, that they encountered a registrationthey were notthey
1027	had a problem with their registration, they had a problem getting an absentee ballot and so
1028	forth. And that looks like it is in the range of 2 to 4 million, so that comes
1029	Chairman Schumer. Right. Let's just clarify that. We could always say, well,
1030	they should have registered. That is probably what Mr. Nelson would say, right?
1031	Mr. Nelson. Correct.
1032	Chairman Schumer. Let me give you the other side. I mean, this was sort of
1033	interesting to me, and make what you can of it.
1034	This was back in 1973 and Herman Badillo was running for mayor of New York
1035	City. He was the first Hispanic mayor running. And I was a political junkie. I was not
1036	an elected official then, but I was at the polling places. And there were large numbers of
1037	Hispanic people who came to the polling place and said, I want to vote for Herman Badillo.
1038	They were citizens. They had not registered because a month before I guess they
1039	had not focused on the election or whatever, but they truly wanted to register then. Now,
1040	we can get into a sort of moral argument; well, they should have and it is their fault, or they
1041	should be able to, it is the system's fault. But they would fit into that category of people
1042	who wanted to vote but were not registered.
1043	Is that fair to say, Mr. Ansolabehere?
1044	Mr. Ansolabehere. Yes.
1045	Chairman Schumer. Okay. I did not even know, by the way, in some of these
1046	precincts, that there were any Hispanic people living there. It was so amazing. It was
1047	sort of like a magnet. It showed me the power of elections andit was very interesting.
1048	Yes, Mr. Persily?
1049	Mr. Persily. Sort of one point on that, which is in the 2004 election, we had about
1050	1.9 million provisional ballots that were cast. About half were cast on what are called
1051	Section 203 covered jurisdictions. These are areas with high language minority
1052	populations under the Voting Rights Act.
1053	But what is happening in the registration system is that it is falling
1054	disproportionately on certain communities who, for example, when they get to the polling
1055	place are confronted either with a registration problem or with someone who does not
1056	understand their name or it does not match up because it is in a different language. And

L057	then they end up casting provisional ballots, which is one of the reasons why looking at
L058	provisional ballots gives us a glimpse of the problem.
L059	Chairman Schumer. Right. I interrupted. Go ahead. Did you finish all the
L060	numbers that you have thrown out?
L061	Mr. Ansolabehere. No.
L062	Chairman Schumer. Keep going.
L063	Mr. Persily. I am fine.
L064	Chairman Schumer. Okay. But you had additional numbers that do not
L065	contradictnothing in your study and Mr. Ansolabehere's study contradict one another, do
L066	they, Mr. Persily?
L067	Mr. Persily. As in most things in life, I take my numbers from Harvard, so I will
L068	defer to Stephen Ansolabehere on this.
L069	Chairman Schumer. Okay, right.
L070	Now, I just wanted to ask you, because my friend, Senator Bennett, talked about the
L071	statistics, the source of your data is the Cooperative Congressional Election Study, right?
L072	Mr. Ansolabehere. That is correct.
L073	Chairman Schumer. And is that generally regarded by the academics on both
L074	sides as a reliable, reputable source of data?
L075	Mr. Ansolabehere. Yes, in fact BYU is one of the major participants in this
L076	study.
L077	Chairman Schumer. Oh, now you are talking, Mr. Ansolabehere.
L078	Senator Bennett. I went to the University of Utah.
L079	[Laughter.]
L080	Mr. Persily. Can I say one other thing on this?
L081	Chairman Schumer. Yes.
L082	Mr. Persily. We will get more data in a month, and I suspect the Census data will
L083	confirm this, and also that the Election Day Survey from the Election Assistance
L084	Commission will also give us some confirmation of those numbers, so we do not need
L085	simply to rely on those.
L086	Mr. Ansolabehere. And there was a separate study that the Pew Foundation
L087	sponsored.

Chairman Schumer. So we do not have a dispute, even among those on either

1089	side of the aisle here, so to speakMr. Gans, as one of the witnesses, you do not dispute
1090	those statistics at all.
1091	Mr. Gans. No.
1092	Chairman Schumer. And do you, Mr. Nelson?
1093	Mr. Nelson. I do not have enough insight into the methodology.
1094	Chairman Schumer. Okay. But Mr. Gans, just for the record, is a witness
1095	chosen by Senator Bennett.
1096	Mr. Gans. Yes, but not because I am a Republican.
1097	Chairman Schumer. No, I know. But you know I understand that completely.
1098	I met youyou do not remember, but I met you in the Eugene McCarthy campaign in 1968
1099	when I was a freshman.
1100	Mr. Gans. You exhibited great wisdom.
1101	Chairman Schumer. Yes. Well, no. In retrospect, I did not.
1102	[Laughter.]
1103	Chairman Schumer. But in any case, I wanted to ask you, Professor
1104	Ansolabehere, on page 17 of your written testimony, you indicate that 3.8 percent of all
1105	respondents showed up to the polls and found they had problems with voter registration.
1106	In other words, they showed up, they wanted to vote, and had problems.
1107	If those numbers remain consistent nationally, how many voters would that be?
1108	Mr. Ansolabehere. I would have toit is like teaching
1109	Chairman Schumer. Okay, you can provide that
1110	Mr. Ansolabehere. 3.8if you just take 3.8 of the number of
1111	Chairman Schumer. People who showed up.
1112	Mr. Ansolabehere. people who showed up, the 133 million.
1113	Chairman Schumer. Yes. So it would be 3.8 of 133 million
1114	Mr. Ansolabehere. Right.
1115	Chairman Schumer which is 1, 3 timesa little less than 4, about 5 million.
1116	Mr. Ansolabehere. Four or 5 percent5 million.
1117	Chairman Schumer. Right, okay.
1118	Another question. Are you measuring the substance and extent of voter
1119	registration problems for the 44 million eligible voters who were not registered in 2008?
1120	How do we begin to determine who these people are and why they are not registered to

1121	vote?
1122	Mr. Ansolabehere. We are going to look closely at the CPS Study because they
1123	do have a pretty extensive battery of questions having to do with the reasons for
1124	non-registration. From past studies that they conducted in 2000 and 2004, those data look
1125	like they are quite similar to the extent to which people are not registering because they are
1126	not interested. That is the major source of the problem. But, you know, about 20 percent
1127	are not registering because of these other issues, such as registration dates and mobility.
1128	Chairman Schumer. Okay.
1129	Professor Gans, you had mentioned before that the U.S. ranks 139 out of 172
1130	countries in voter participation. I think that is counterintuitive to most of us here in this
1131	country.
1132	Can you elaborate a little on that? What is the country above us, what is the
1133	country below us, why are we so low? Is it, Third World countries are better than us;
1134	those who have democracies?
1135	Mr. Gans. Several Third World countries are better than us. Back in 1976, we
1136	did a survey of nonvoters. Peter Hart did the survey and his line was that we have a higher
1137	percentage only than Botswana. And then Botswana had an election, which had a higher
1138	turnout than we did.
1139	Chairman Schumer. Why do you think that is?
1140	Mr. Gans. Well, it is a lot of reasons.
1141	Chairman Schumer. Is it just the registration?
1142	Mr. Gans. Oh, no, not at all. But it is true that we areas far as advanced
1143	democracies are concerned, one of the very few that put the burden on the citizen to qualify
1144	him or herself via registration and requalify when they move. Most of the other
1145	countriesthe government does in one way or another—create the list of eligible voters.
1146	Chairman Schumer. What is your view? Does the system we saw in Iraq,
1147	where people put their fingerthey put some kind of indelible ink on their finger. Does
1148	that work better or worse than our system?
1149	Mr. Gans. Iraq comes closer to my biometric than our system. But do I want to
1150	emulate Iraq? I do not think so.
1151	Chairman Schumer. But seriously

Mr. Gans. We have lots of different problems. I mean, part of the reason our

1153	voting is lower than most other democracies is we do not have a parliamentary democracy
1154	and, therefore, we, a) do not have a very class oriented society as other democracies do; we
1155	do not have class oriented parties; we have a complex system of government; we have a
1156	multiplicity of officers that we elect, all of which makes people's vote feel less instrumental
1157	than voting for one person who represents your point of view.
1158	Chairman Schumer. Let me ask you this question.
1159	Mr. Gans. Yes, sir?
1160	Chairman Schumer. Let's just assume for the moment we could develop a
1161	system where people would not have to register, could show up that day and yet it would
1162	have no fraud, just hypothetically.
1163	Mr. Gans. Okay. That is what I am proposing.
1164	Chairman Schumer. You are tryingI know.
1165	Do you think turnout would go up a great deal?
1166	Mr. Gans. I think turnout would go up. I mean, in our recent history, you can
1167	look less at registration and more at motivation as to the reasons why we have higher or
1168	lower turnout. What this would do, would enhance the possibility and high turnout in
1169	high motivation election; that we would have substantially more people than we already
1170	have, and it may or may not make much difference in low motivation elections.
1171	Chairman Schumer. Right.
1172	What do you say, Ms. Clarke and Mr. Goldman, on that?
1173	Ms. Clarke. One thing I would note is that there are some things that are
1174	compulsory in our society. Jury service, for example, no choice, you have to do it. So
1175	this idea about mandatory voting, I kind of like the notion of really encouraging as many
1176	citizens as possible to participate.
1177	Chairman Schumer. Support a fine?
1178	Ms. Clarke. I am sorry?
1179	Chairman Schumer. Would you support a fine like in the Australian system?
1180	Ms. Clarke. Sure, particularly if it were accompanied by low prosecution.
1181	[Laughter.]
1182	Ms. Clarke. But I think we want to figure out how we can tear down barriers.
1183	I am concernedand I just want to note this concern for the record about proposals
1184	about national ID requirements, which I think only erect additional barriers, unnecessary

barriers, that would lock out even greater numbers of people from the process.

A final point I want to underscore is that we really should focus on the design of voter registration forms, which varies tremendously across the board. I have a copy here of Louisiana's voter registration form, probably designed with a 6-point font.

Chairman Schumer. Hold it up. Hold it up.

Ms. Clarke. You need a magnifying glass to get through it. And it is terribly unfortunate that it requires voters to list information over and over and over again. And election officials can reject the forms if somebody fails to check the box that they are a citizen, but, nevertheless, signs the affirmation at the bottom, under penalty of perjury, where they swear that they are citizens. We have really got to streamline these forms and make it easier for all who want to participate to register.

Chairman Schumer. Do you want to say something, Mr. Goldman, in reference to Mr. Gans, the comment I asked Mr. Gans?

Mr. Goldman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that we already saw that this would increase turnout if we had a better registration system. I mean, we were just talking about 3.8 percent of voters who tried to go to the polls and tried to vote but were not able to because of registration. Those voters are not included in tallies, whether they are exact or inexact tallies of how many voters did show up. And I think 3.8 percentage points in an American election is actually an enormous amount.

Australia actually has an automatic and permanent voter registration system, so they do not have the same problems that we do. While we can quibble about whether or not it is a 19th century system or not, the provisional balloting system and the problems with absentee balloting are largely a symptom of a problem with the registration system. We would not have--for instance, in California, in Los Angeles County, 85 percent of provisional ballots that do not count are not counted because of the registration system, which is an enormous amount of ballots, since each one of those takes time and money to be able to distribute them and count them. And they delay certification and things like that.

So we are talking about the correlative costs on the rest of the election system and making election officials doing basically three or four times the work that they would otherwise have to, spending half of their registration budget. That adds up to millions and millions of dollars because of a system which was conceived in the 19th century has not

1217 been much updated other than a couple of band-aids that have basically just really 1218 illustrated how bad the system is to begin with. 1219 **Chairman Schumer**. Senator Bennett will get the last round of questions. 1220 **Senator Bennett.** Thank you very much. This has been a very interesting 1221 morning. I appreciate it. I think kind of a potpourri of reactions here. 1222 You get all of your data from Harvard? **Mr. Gans.** No, I do not. 1223 1224 **Senator Bennett.** No. Mr. Persily. 1225 **Mr. Persily.** The Cooperative Congressional Election Survey. 1226 **Senator Bennett.** Oh, okay. 1227 **Mr. Persily.** I mean, without belaboring the point, it is a coalition of 30 1228 universities. Steve is instrumental in running it. Stanford's Doug Rivers, is instrumental 1229 in running it. So I might have been a little loose there, but it is a broad-based coalition. 1230 **Senator Bennett.** We are all being a little bit flip here in one way or another. 1231 There is a book that I remember. I should have brought it here because I should 1232 quote it exactly. But it comes out of my memory bank as we are having this conversation, 1233 entitled, The Vanishing Voter, and it was written from Harvard. And the two primary 1234 reasons, according to the book, why voter participation has been going down in the United 1235 States were, number one, the declining power of political parties. Political parties exist, 1236 whether they are the Whigs or whoever, to get people to the polls. And the declining 1237 power of political parties is one of the reasons why, according to this book, voters are 1238 vanishing. The second was the attitude of the media, that the media is constantly 1239 denigrating politics and politicians to the point that people feel, why have anything to do 1240 with it. 1241 I remember another piece, random out of my database, of a woman who was asked 1242 how do you vote, and she said, I never vote; it only encourages them. And that, again, is 1243 manifestation of the attitude that the media has for politics. And if you listen to the late 1244 night shows, you find that there is constant, constant, dripping of acid on all politicians. 1245 We are all stupid; we are all corrupt. And we are all objects of constant downgrading 1246 attacks until, of course, we have left office. And then we might, in some ways, be brought 1247 up at these late night shows as an example of how the present politicians are all stupid and 1248 corrupt because this one who has passed from the scene is not. This has nothing to do with

1249	registration. So let's not view this whole thing in a silo that says that registration is the
1250	sole cause of our various problems.
1251	I thank you for the information about your methodology. It gives me a greater
1252	sense of security in depending on your numbers than I had when I came in to this. But I
1253	would just say to the press that is around here, if you are going to say the registration
1254	problem has kept people from the polls, we go to the 2 to 3 million number that comes ou
1255	of your study instead of the 9 million number that we heard later. And I welcome the idea
1256	that there are further studies that are going on and we will get more statistical information
1257	about this.
1258	I appreciate the work you have all done. The only one last comment I would
1259	leave
1260	Mr. Nelson, you have a registration system in South Dakota.
1261	Mr. Nelson. Correct.
1262	Senator Bennett. North Dakota does not.
1263	Mr. Nelson. Correct.
1264	Senator Bennett. You have a higher turnout in South Dakota than they have in
1265	North Dakota.
1266	Mr. Nelson. Correct.
1267	Senator Bennett. I do not know what that proves, but it is an interesting thing to
1268	lay down
1269	Chairman Schumer. It is warmer.
1270	Senator Bennett. I have never been to either one, so I will leave you to say that.
1271	But the registration system has not produced in your state a lower vote turnout or a
1272	non-registration system in as close a control as we can find in a neighboring state. So,
1273	again, I say that to underscore my point that decisions not to vote or voter participation at
1274	low levels is not entirely a factor of the registration challenge that we face.
1275	Having said that, I think the panel has demonstrated that we have work to do here,
1276	and I appreciate the view of the academics who have studied it carefully. I appreciate the
1277	view of the man who is on the firing line who has to deal with it, and I hope we pay
1278	attention to all of this.
1279	Mr. Gans, I am very interested in your solution. I will not publicly endorse it at
1280	this point, but I will say I am very interested in it.

1281	Mr. Gans. Thank you.
1282	Chairman Schumer. I want to thank both Senator Bennett and our panel. I
1283	think it was really a great start for this committee for the year. So I want to thank all of
1284	you for coming. We have a number of statements for the hearing record. Without
1285	objection, I request that a series of statements, which I will submit to the record, be added
1286	in.
1287	The record will remain open for five business days for additional statements from
1288	members and the public. And if the witnesses have no objection, I would also request the
1289	record remain open for five days for additional questions that we on the panel might submit
1290	to you, and you can answer in writing, if that is okay. Good.
1291	All right. Since there is no further business before the Committee, we are
1292	adjourned, subject to the call of the chair.
1293	[The information for the record follows:]
1294	
1295	[Whereupon, at 11:41 a.m., the Committee was adjourned.]